

Concerning item (3) above, the widespread occurrence of *E. capillare*, as already demonstrated, is most probably an artifact resulting from imprecise historical taxonomy and generalizations. Schuchert suggests that ‘many records of *E. tenellum* probably refer to *E. capillare*’, but this generalization on the synonymy does not resolve the taxonomic problem that has arisen and given rise to the chaotic situation found for the poorly defined and presumably cosmopolitan species *E. capillare*. In fact, Marques & Vervoort (2006, p. 9) gave a partial (but not exhaustive) list of authors who recorded specimens assigned to *E. tenellum*, but there are at least 65 references to the species. There is no possibility of determining how many of these references are, indeed, to *E. capillare*, and most records should be ignored if no further study of the original material is possible.

Item (4) above is the most important aspect of Marques & Vervoort’s and Schuchert’s proposals, and in which we disagree. This refers to the acceptance of *E. tenellum* auct. Basically, Schuchert considered the neotype inappropriate because it is ‘fascicled’ and, therefore, would differ from most of the records previously assigned to *E. tenellum*. This would indeed make the neotype unrepresentative of the meaning of previous authors and therefore unsuitable to be considered as widespread and well known. However, the colony is unfascicled, as correctly described by Hirohito (1988, p. 88). We (Marques & Vervoort, 2006, p. 9, caption of fig. A) mistakenly described the colony as fascicled and generated the confusion. Therefore, it is not possible based only on morphology (unless for those studies including description of the gonophores, as in Calder, 1972), to determine whether colonies previously described as *E. tenellum* refer to *E. capillare* or to the proposed neotype.

Finally, the genus *Eudendrium* has many nominal species (over 100) that do not fit with well-established species. Based on these arguments, I propose to follow the suggestion Vervoort and I put forward, even though Schuchert’s proposal would also resolve the nomenclatural problems.

Additional references

- Lindner, A. & Calder, D.R. 2000. Case 3166. *Campanularia noliformis* McCrady, 1859 (currently *Clytia noliformis*; Cnidaria, Hydrozoa): proposed conservation of the specific name by the designation of a neotype. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, **57**(3): 140–143.
- Marques, A.C. & Vervoort, W. 2006. *Eudendrium tenellum* Allman, 1877 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa): proposed conservation of usage of the specific name by the designation of a neotype. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, **63**(1): 8–11.
- Watson, J.E. 1985. The genus *Eudendrium* (Hydrozoa: Hydroida) from Australia. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria*, **97**(4): 179–221.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 (currently *Papillifera papillaris*; Mollusca, Gastropoda)
(Case 3319; see BZN **62**: 130–133; **63**: 46–47, 130–131)

F. Giusti and G. Manganelli

*Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali, Università di Siena, Via Mattioli 4,
I-53100 Siena, Italy (e-mail for Prof. Giusti: giustif@unisi.it)*

We thank Welter-Schultes (BZN 63: 46–47) for expounding frankly his ideas on how to manage problems of nomenclature in his refusal of our application. We stress, however, that his ideas are not in line with the Code. For example, he writes (p. 46): 'I think that a simple species taxon possibly being threatened by a senior synonym alone does not justify an application to the Commission. *Helix papillaris* is not the type species of an important genus . . .' and a few lines further on: 'Species names have to be replaced by older synonyms . . . Although *Papillifera papillaris* is a well-known name, I could also live with this name being changed'. These phrases indicate that he disagrees with some of the main principles of the Code, namely:

- (1) 'The Code . . . provides the name that is to be used for a taxon whatever taxonomic limits and rank are given to it' (Point 2 of Principles, p. xix);
- (2) 'Nomenclatural rules are tools that are designed to provide maximum stability compatible with taxonomic freedom. . . . Therefore the rules must enable the Principle of Priority to be set aside on occasions when its application would be destructive of stability or universality, or would cause confusion' (Point 4 of Principles, p. xx).

The latter point is particularly interesting in our case, because in the last 50 years *papillaris* has been cited much more often than *bidens* (a list of citations is held by the Commission Secretariat).

In any case, as we demonstrated in our application, problems of priority are secondary: *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758 is not a senior synonym of *Helix papillaris* Müller, but a different species characterized by reddish shell ('*rufescens*') with simply crenulate suture ('*sutura subcrenata*').

Almost anything is possible, but the suggestion that Linnaeus may have examined an 'old and eroded' shell in which 'the white dots' (the dots are presumably papillae) 'are expressed much more faintly than in fresh shells', seems unlikely, since Linnaeus described the shell as '*pellucida*', i.e. transparent and therefore fresh.

Confusion between the two species is impossible since the description given by Müller (1774) for his *Helix papillaris* is anything but 'not clear enough' as Welter-Schultes claims (against Giusti & Manganelli, 2005, p. 131, para. 6). Indeed, it includes certain characters which, coexisting in a shell, are absolutely diagnostic of Müller's species: shell ashen-grey ('*cinerea*') with sutures bordered by a reddish band and with white papillae ('*intersectiones anfractuum fuscescunt, punctis elevatis sive papillis parvis candidis pulchre interstinctae*').

As clearly stated by Giusti & Manganelli (2005, p. 132), the purpose of designating a neotype was only to establish a landmark for future morphological and molecular studies.

The fact that Linnaeus (1767) included Bonanni (1684) in the list of references has no practical consequences, if not as a source of confusion, because *Turbo bidens* remains that defined by Linnaeus (1758).

Finally, the last paragraph of Welter-Schultes's comment contains personal considerations which are irrelevant to the present problem. These considerations could be more appropriately advanced in the event of a revision of the Code.